A footnote written by Agassiz to the explanation of pl. 44" of his German translation (Buckland, 1838) of Buckland's 1836b book establishes the name *Atramentarius* for the ink-sac illustrated in fig. 7, which Engeser & Donovan (1996, p. 255) state is recognizable as *Belemnoteuthis montefiorei* Buckman, 1880. Donovan & Crane (1992, p. 280) pointed out that the correct original spelling of the generic name customarily spelled *Belemnoteuthis* is *Belemnotheutis* Pearce, 1842 (p. 593); I followed the original spelling in my *Fossilium Catalogus* (Riegraf, 1995, p. 27). *Atramentarius* Buckland & Agassiz in Buckland, 1838 is a senior synonym of *Belemnotheutis*, a name which (as *Belemnoteuthis*) is in current usage (references cited by Engeser & Donovan, p. 254). I therefore propose that the Commission be asked to suppress the nominal genus *Atramentarius* in order to conserve *Belemnotheutis* Pearce, 1842 (type species by subsequent monotypy by Pearce (1847, pls. 15–16) *Belemnoteuthis* [sic] *antiquus* Pearce, 1847, pls. 15-16).

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the name *Atramentarius* Buckland & Agassiz in Buckland, 1838 for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the name *Belemnotheutis* Pearce, 1842 (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent monotypy (Pearce, 1847) *Belemnoteuthis antiqua* Pearce, 1847;

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *antiqua* Pearce, 1847, as published in the binomen *Belemnoteuthis antiquus* [recte *antiqua*] (specific name of the type species of *Belemnotheutis* Pearce, 1842);

(4) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology the following names:
   (a) *Atramentarius* Buckland & Agassiz in Buckland, 1838, as suppressed in (1) above;
   (b) *Belemnoteuthis* Pearce, 1847 (unavailable as an incorrect subsequent spelling of *Belemnotheutis*).

Additional references

Buckland, W. 1838. *Geologie und Mineralogie in Beziehung zur natürlichen Theologie*, vol. 2. 69 pls. with explanations. Leibrock, Neufchâtel.

Donovan, D.T. & Crane, M.D. 1992. The type material of the Jurassic cephalopod *Belemnotheutis*. *Palaeontology*, **35**: 273–296.

Pearce, J.C. 1842. On the mouths of ammonites, and on fossils contained in laminated beds of the Oxford Clay, discovered in cutting the Great Western Railway, near Christian Malford in Wiltshire. *Proceedings of the Geological Society of London*, **3**: 592–594.

Pearce, J.C. 1847. On the fossil Cephalopoda constituting the genus *Belemnoteuthis*, Pearce. *London Geological Journal*, **2**: 75–78, pls. 15–16.

Comments on the proposed designation of *Foenus unguiculatus* Westwood, 1841 as the type species of *Pseudofoenus* Kieffer, 1902 (Insecta, Hymenoptera)

(Case 2950; see BZN **53**: 261–263)

(1) R.W. Crosskey

Department of Entomology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

The applicants have referred to my past work on GASTERUPTERIIDAE and, since I retain an interest in this family, I should like to contribute a comment on this case. In essence I ask the Commission to reject the application in its present form.

I agree that in the unusual situation described by A.D. Austin, J.T. Jennings and M.S. Harvey some Commission action is desirable. However, I do not think they have provided adequate background for a Commission decision, nor do I think that their solution is a wise one; it leaves the identity of *Gasteruption pedunculatum* Schletterer, 1889 unresolved when this is the crux of the matter to be settled. To pick a new type species for *Pseudofoenus* and leave the old one in limbo largely defeats the object.

The first point (nomenclatural) to establish is the status of the surviving specimen (male) of *G. pedunculatum* in the Berlin Museum. Jennings & Austin (1994, pp. 1301–1302) referred to this as the holotype but, as stated in para. 3 of the application, there must have been at least two original specimens because Schletterer wrote: 'Type in königl. naturhistorischen Museum zu Berlin und im naturhistorischen Museum zu Zürich'. The Berlin specimen clearly has syntype status. In a practical sense it is useless as the gaster is missing. The second noteworthy point (taxonomic) is that Schletterer was very doubtful whether his *pedunculatum* was really a new species; he wrote (p. 468) '*F. unguiculatus* Westw. ist sehr wahrscheinlich identisch mit *pedunculatum*' and immediately under the species heading gave the possible synonymy in the form '? *Foenus unguiculatus* Westw., Ann. Nat. Hist., T. VII, p. 537, ♂ . . . 1841' (Westwood was in error as to the sex; the original specimen was in fact female).

To circumvent the present major weakness (*G. pedunculatum* still left as a nomen dubium) it seems clear to me that the application should be revised. The Commission should be asked to set aside the useless *pedunculatum* syntype and designate a neotype for this nominal species. As nothing prevents designation of neotypes of opposite sex from that of original types (Article 75d(4) of the Code), the chosen neotype specimen should be a female. Furthermore, it should be a female of *Pseudofoenus unguiculatus* (Westwood), as the female of this species has a known identity from its holotype. This way, four things take place at once: the identity of *G. pedunculatum* is fixed, the synomymy of *pedunculatum* with *unguiculatus* is established, the same taxonomic species is kept as the type of *Pseudofoenus*, and the action is in accord with Schletterer's originally suspected synonymy of the two nominal species. The nominal type species remains unchanged as *G. pedunculatum* although its name is synonymous with the earlier *F. unguiculatus*.

If the holotype of *unguiculatus* is in good enough condition the best course would be for the Commission to designate it as a neotype for *pedunculatum*, thereby establishing objective synonymy. If not, then subjective synonymy by use of a recently collected specimen will suffice.

(2) A.D. Austin & J.T. Jennings

Department of Crop Protection, Waite Campus, The University of Adelaide,
P.O. Glen Osmond, South Australia 5064, Australia

M.S. Harvey

Western Australian Museum, Francis Street, Perth, Western Australia 6000,
Australia

We wish to reply to Roger Crosskey's comment (above) on our application. His proposal raises some interesting issues over what we thought would be a straightforward application. After considering his comments at some length we believe his proposal to be overly complex compared with ours. There are undoubtedly numerous solutions to this problem but we do not think that Crosskey's is the best one.

The basis of Crosskey's solution rests on the fact that Schletterer suspected *G. pedunculatum* and *F. unguiculatus* might be the same species. However, there is absolutely no validity in this and we are surprised that Crosskey gives it any credence — it is based on Schletterer's view of over 100 years ago. He had little or no understanding of the taxonomy of the group compared to present-day concepts; he probably did not inspect any specimens other than his own (of which he possibly had two), and hence relied on Westwood's description which was so brief as to be meaningless. If we were to propose such an artificial synonymy there would be a very good chance that we would be synonymising historically different species because the existing type of *G. pedunculatum* lacks the diagnostic genitalia to accurately associate it with any taxonomic species.

Crosskey is correct that we (Jennings & Austin, 1994) erroneously listed the specimen of *pedunculatus* as the holotype when there were apparently at least two syntypes, but the second specimen has never been located by any author since Schletterer. We have made an extensive attempt to find it, without success, including one of us visiting all likely European collections.

Our solution to the problem, designating *Foenus unguiculatus* Westwood, 1841 as the type species of *Pseudofoenus*, has the distinct advantage that the type species would be denoted by the oldest available name. Certainly the name *G. pedunculatum* would remain a nomen dubium but, since it is inevitably invalid as a junior synonym of either *F. unguiculatus* or of *F. crassipes* Smith, 1876, this presents no problem.

For this reason we firmly believe that Crosskey's approach is unnecessarily complicated.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the names *Labrus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Cichlasoma* Swainson, 1839 and *Polycentrus* Müller & Troschel, 1849 by the designation of neotypes for *Labrus bimaculatus* Linnaeus, 1758 and *L. punctatus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Osteichthyes, Perciformes)

(Cases 2880 and 2905; see BZN **50**: 215-218 and **53**: 106 111; **54**: 106–116)

Hans-J. Paepke

Naturhistorisches Forschungsinstitut, Museum für Naturkunde der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Invalidenstrasse 43, D-10115 Berlin, Germany

In BZN **54**: 109–115 (June 1997) Dr Sven Kullander has contributed a considerable number of interesting arguments to the discussion on the names *Labrus punctatus* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Polycentrus schomburgkii* Müller & Troschel, 1849. I cannot agree, however, with his suggestion that the proposals I made in Case 2880 (published in BZN **50**: 215–218) should be set aside until a systematic revision of the genus *Polycentrus* has been carried out. I understand his endeavour to retain the Linnaean name *punctatus* but, since the well known name *schomburgkii* has been used in favour